



Gauss–Bonnet Black Holes and Holographic Heat Engines Beyond Large N

Clifford V. Johnson

*Department of Physics and Astronomy
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0484, U.S.A.*

johnson1, [at] usc.edu

Abstract

Working in the extended black hole thermodynamics where a dynamical cosmological constant defines a thermodynamic pressure p , we study the efficiency of heat engines that perform mechanical work *via* the pdV terms now present in the First Law. Here the black hole itself is the working substance, and we focus on a judiciously chosen engine cycle. We work in Gauss–Bonnet–Einstein–Maxwell gravity with negative cosmological constant and compare the results for these “holographic” heat engines to that of previously studied cases with no Gauss–Bonnet sector. From the dual holographic large N field theory perspective, this amounts to studying the effects of a class of $1/N$ corrections to the efficiency of the cycle.

1 Introduction

By making the cosmological constant Λ a dynamical variable in a theory of gravity, an interesting extension of the classic black hole thermodynamics [1–4] can be made¹. The cosmological constant of the spacetime in question supplies a pressure *via* $p = -\Lambda/8\pi$, usually missing (along with its counterpart V) from the traditional framework². While the temperature and entropy remain related to the surface gravity and area in the usual way, the mass ends up being related not to the internal energy U of the system, but the *enthalpy*, H , as discussed in ref. [9]:

$$M = H \equiv U + pV, \quad T = \frac{\kappa}{2\pi}, \quad S = \frac{A}{4}, \quad (1)$$

where the volume V is the conjugate of the pressure $V \equiv (\partial H/\partial p)|_S = (\partial M/\partial p)|_S$, following from the First Law which is now $dM = TdS + Vdp$. The black holes may have other parameters such as gauge charges q_i and angular momenta J_i , and these, with their conjugates the potentials Φ_i and angular velocities Ω_i , enter additively into the First Law in the usual manner. This extended black hole thermodynamics formalism works in multiple dimensions. (Interestingly, in the static black hole case, the thermodynamic volume V is associated with the naive volume occupied by the black hole itself: The volume of the ball of radius given by the horizon radius (denoted r_+ here).

It was noted in ref. [17] that since pressure and volume variables are now present alongside temperature and entropy, a device for extracting useful mechanical work from heat energy — a traditional heat engine — may be defined. (Similarly, heat pumps or refrigerators, where instead work is done to transfer heat from a cold reservoir to a hot one may be defined as well.) Such devices were dubbed “holographic heat engines”, since especially in the case of negative cosmological constant (where pressure is positive) such cycles presumably represent a journey through a family of holographically dual [18–22] non-gravitational large N field theories defined in one dimension fewer. The physics of such engines may possibly have interesting and instructive implications for those field theory tours, which may be uncovered when the dictionary between this extended thermodynamics and holography is fully worked out, as discussed in ref. [17], but that is not the subject of this paper and so we will turn away from that issue henceforth³.

The black hole defines an equation of state, coming from the relation between the temperature, horizon radius, other black hole parameters, and the cosmological constant. It defines (either implicitly or explicitly) a function $p(V, T)$, and our engine can be defined as a closed path in the

¹For a selection of references, see refs. [5–13]. See also the early work in refs. [14–16].

²Here we are using geometrical units where $G, c, \hbar, k_B$ have been set to unity. We may restore them using dimensional analysis when required later.

³A recent paper [23] has made considerable progress in working out the dictionary, and will certainly be relevant. Thanks to Phuc Nguyen for pointing out this reference.

p - V plane, allowing for the input of an amount of heat Q_H , and the exhaust of an amount Q_C . The total mechanical work done, by the First Law, is of course $W = Q_H - Q_C$. A central quantity, the efficiency of the heat engine, is defined to be $\eta = W/Q_H = 1 - Q_C/Q_H$. Figure 1 shows the standard logic of the energy flows for one cycle of the engine.




Figure 1: The heat engine flows.

The exact properties of the engine depends upon the equation of state (defined by the type of black hole⁴) and the choice of path in the p - V plane. Of course, the efficiency of the engine is bounded above by the Carnot efficiency given by that of a reversible heat engine made by expanding along an isotherm, and then an adiabat, followed by contracting along an isotherm and then using an adiabat to close the path. With the isotherms at temperatures T_H and T_C , where $T_H > T_C$, the Carnot efficiency is $\eta_C = 1 - T_C/T_H$.

Interestingly, as also noted in ref. [17], the other simple (but in general less efficient) choice, connecting the isotherms by isochoric paths defining the Stirling cycle, turns out to be equivalent to Carnot for static black holes. This is because in such cases the entropy and the volume both depend on the same single variable, the horizon radius, and are therefore not independent [10]. So isochores and adiabats are identical in such cases making Stirling equivalent to Carnot.

That last observation is also equivalent to the fact that the specific heat at constant volume, C_V , vanishes for static black holes. On the other hand, C_p can be quite explicitly computed in terms of r_+ and hence the entropy or the volume. This is useful because it means that another cycle in the p - V plane is natural to think about: A rectangle composed of isobars and isochores. The heat flows and hence the efficiency is in principle readily computable if one has a suitable expression for C_p . Looking at figure 2, the work done along the isobars is:

$$W = (V_2 - V_1) (p_1 - p_4) , \quad (2)$$

where the subscripts refer to the quantities evaluated at the corners labeled (1,2,3,4). The heat flows take place along the top and bottom, with the upper isobar giving the net inflow of heat,




Figure 2: Our engine.

⁴Refs. [24–27] have since done studies of holographic heat engines using various kinds of black holes in diverse dimensions.

which is therefore Q_H , and so:

$$Q_H = \int_{T_1}^{T_2} C_p(p_1, T) dT, \quad (3)$$

The efficiency is then $\eta = W/Q_H$. To get an explicit expression requires one to be able to write the specific heat in terms of T in order to do the integral. This turns out to be difficult to do exactly, since the natural variable to get C_p in terms of is r_h , and turning that into a T dependence is somewhat messy. It is at this point that one can move to a more tractable regime for the problem, and do a high temperature expansion. In the next section we will review how that works somewhat more thoroughly than was explored in the original reference, in order to prepare for the generalisation we will explore in this paper, the case of black holes in Gauss–Bonnet gravity [28], with $\Lambda < 0$ [29].

A Gauss–Bonnet action coupled to an Einstein–Hilbert–Maxwell sector will be our focus, with the lowest non-trivial dimension being $D = 5$ since in lower dimensions the Gauss–Bonnet action is purely topological. Adding a Gauss–Bonnet action to the Einstein–Hilbert–Maxwell action (with $\Lambda < 0$) is interesting and important to consider since generically, whatever the parent theory of quantum gravity may be, there will be higher order corrections to the pure Einstein sector, and Gauss–Bonnet is a particular combination of terms that allows for tractable systematic investigation of the effects of such corrections. Additionally, such terms represent part of the $1/N$ correction to the large N limit of the holographically dual $SU(N)$ -like gauge field theory. So while this study is interesting in its own right, exploring the properties of holographic heat engines after including corrections to the leading order gravity theory, there is also the possibility that we learn something about how their properties are adjusted away from the large N limit, using Gauss–Bonnet as a laboratory, in the spirit of *e.g.* refs. [30, 31].

We will be able to answer the question (at least in the high temperature limit) as to whether the key quantity, the efficiency of the heat engine, increases or decreases in the presence of the Gauss–Bonnet terms. It is not *a priori* obvious what the answer should be. On the one hand the heat capacity of the holes may increase or decrease, but on the other hand since the Gauss–Bonnet terms also affect their geometry (affecting r_+ and hence the thermodynamic volume V), their capacity to do work may also be affected one way or another. How the overall ratio between these two quantities is affected is subtle, and we uncover it in this paper.

2 Einstein–Hilbert–Maxwell

Let’s review and extend somewhat the computations for the case of heat engines made from Reissner–Nordström black hole solutions of the Einstein–Hilbert–Maxwell system, which has bulk

action in D -dimensions:

$$I = \frac{1}{16\pi} \int d^D x \sqrt{-g} (R - 2\Lambda - F^2) , \quad (4)$$

where the cosmological constant

$$\Lambda = -\frac{(D-1)(D-2)}{2l^2} , \quad (5)$$

sets a length scale l .

2.1 The Black Holes

The black hole has mass and charge parameters m and q , with metric⁵

$$ds^2 = -Y(r)dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{Y(r)} + r^2 d\Omega_{D-2}^2 \quad (6)$$

where

$$Y(r) = 1 - \frac{m}{r^{D-3}} + \frac{q^2}{r^{2D-6}} + \frac{r^2}{l^2} , \quad (7)$$

and $d\Omega_{D-2}^2$ is the metric on a round $D-2$ sphere with volume ω_{D-2} , and there is a gauge potential that is chosen to vanish on the horizon located at $r = r_+$, the largest positive real root of $Y(r)$:

$$A_t = \frac{q}{c} \left(\frac{1}{r_+^{D-3}} - \frac{1}{r^{D-3}} \right) , \quad \text{with} \quad c = \sqrt{\frac{2(D-3)}{D-2}} . \quad (8)$$

The mass and charge of the solution are given by:

$$M = \frac{(D-2)\omega_{D-2}}{16\pi} m \quad \text{and} \quad Q = \sqrt{2(D-2)(D-3)} \left(\frac{\omega_{D-2}}{8\pi} \right) q . \quad (9)$$

The requirement of regularity of the Euclidean section fixes the temperature T according to:

$$T = \frac{1}{4\pi} Y' |_{r=r_+} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \left(16\pi p \frac{r_+}{(D-2)} + \frac{(D-3)}{r_+} - \frac{(D-3)q^2}{r_+^{2D-5}} \right) , \quad (10)$$

where we have used that $p = -\Lambda/8\pi$ and equation (5). The entropy is $S = \omega_{D-2} r_+^{D-2}/4$. It is natural in writing M as the enthalpy to express it in terms of the two variables, $p = -\Lambda/8\pi$ and S .

The statement that r_+ is the largest root of $Y(r) = 0$ yields, after substituting for p :

$$M(r_+, l) = \frac{(D-2)\omega_{D-2}}{16\pi} \left(r_+^{D-3} + \frac{q^2}{r_+^{D-3}} + 16\pi p \frac{r_+^{D-1}}{(D-1)(D-2)} \right) , \quad (11)$$

and $H(p, S)$ follows by substitution of r_+ in terms of S . For computing the thermodynamic volume $V = \partial H / \partial p|_S$ one may leave things in terms of r_+ , getting:

$$V = \frac{\omega_{D-2}}{(D-1)} r_+^{D-1} . \quad (12)$$

⁵We're using the conventions of ref. [32], and have chosen to work with spacetimes asymptotic to global AdS.

The temperature expression (10) can be re-arranged into an equation of state (or rather a family of equations of state parameterized by q , which we will take to be fixed) in the p - r_+ plane, or equivalently (using equation (12)) the p - V plane:

$$p = \frac{(D-2)}{16\pi} \left(\frac{4\pi T}{r_+} - \frac{(D-3)}{r_+^2} + \frac{(D-3)q^2}{r_+^{2D-4}} \right). \quad (13)$$

Here, and more generally, it is worth noting the characteristic behaviour,

$$pV^{1/(D-1)} \sim T, \quad (14)$$

that dominates in the high temperature limit. In a sense, this is our analogue of the ideal gas limit for our black holes, giving familiar hyperbolae in the p - v plane where $v = V^{1/(D-1)}$. The structure at lower temperatures (giving a multivalued state curve, *etc*) results in non-trivial phase structure explored extensively in refs. [32–34]. The details of the phase structure will not be of interest to us in this paper.

2.2 The Specific Heat

The most important quantity that we'll need to compute our engine efficiency is the specific heat $T\partial S/\partial T$. This is computed from our expression for temperature, and we *could* at this point substitute into it for r_+ in terms of S . Differentiation would then yield the specific heat. In preparation for what will come in our later examples, where substituting for S is no longer elegant, we will follow the alternative route of leaving things written in terms of r_+ and instead differentiate with respect to T , recovering $\partial S/\partial T$ using the chain rule since the dependence $S(r_+)$ is known. The result is, for general D :

$$C = T \frac{\partial S}{\partial T} = \left(1 - \frac{4r_+}{D-2} \frac{\partial p}{\partial T} \right) \left(\frac{\frac{16\pi}{(D-2)(D-3)} p r_+^{2D-4} + r_+^{2D-6} - q^2}{\frac{16\pi}{(D-2)(D-3)} p r_+^{2D-4} - r_+^{2D-6} + (2D-5)q^2} \right) \frac{(D-2)\omega_{D-2}}{4} r_+^{D-2}. \quad (15)$$

Since constant volume is also constant r_+ , we see from equation (10) that $(\partial p/\partial T)_V = (D-2)/4r_+$. Hence, the specific heat at constant volume vanishes $C_V = 0$, while C_p is given by setting $\partial p/\partial T = 0$ in the expression. The vanishing of C_V is the “isochore equals adiabat” result static black holes discussed above. For example, in $D = 4$, with $\omega_2 = 4\pi$, we have [10, 34], after substituting for r_+ in favour of S :

$$C_p = 2\pi r_+^2 \left(\frac{8\pi p r_+^4 + r_+^2 - q^2}{8\pi p r_+^4 - r_+^2 + 3q^2} \right) = 2S \left(\frac{8pS^2 + S - \pi q^2}{8pS^2 - S + 3\pi q^2} \right), \quad (16)$$

in $D = 5$, with $\omega_3 = 2\pi^2$:

$$C_p = \frac{3\pi^2}{2} r_+^3 \left(\frac{8\pi p r_+^6 + 3r_+^4 - 3q^2}{8\pi p r_+^6 - 3r_+^4 + 15q^2} \right) = 3S \left(\frac{32pS^2 + 6(2\pi)^{1/3} S^{4/3} - 3q^2 \pi^3}{32pS^2 - 6(2\pi)^{1/3} S^{4/3} + 15q^2 \pi^3} \right), \quad (17)$$

and in $D = 6$, with $\omega_4 = 8\pi^2/3$:

$$C_p = \frac{8\pi^2}{3} r_+^4 \left(\frac{4\pi p r_+^8 + 3r_+^6 - 3q^2}{4\pi p r_+^8 - 3r_+^6 + 21q^2} \right) = 4S \left(\frac{12pS^2 + 3 \cdot 6^{1/2} S^{3/2} - 4q^2 \pi^3}{12pS^2 - 3 \cdot 6^{1/2} S^{3/2} + 28q^2 \pi^3} \right). \quad (18)$$

2.3 The Engine Efficiency

Now we are ready to take the high temperature limit in order to get explicit expressions for the efficiency of the engine we designed above. With everything written in terms of r_+ , all we need to do is solve for r_+ perturbatively in a large T expansion, using equation (10). From equations (10), (15), and (12), it is straightforward to extract the leading behaviour:

$$\begin{aligned} r_+ &= \frac{(D-2)}{4} \frac{T}{p} + \dots \\ C_p &= \left(\frac{(D-2)}{4} \right)^{D-1} \omega_{D-2} \left(\frac{T}{p} \right)^{D-2} + \dots \\ V &= \frac{\omega_{D-2}}{D-1} \left(\frac{(D-2)}{4} \right)^{D-1} \left(\frac{T}{p} \right)^{D-1} + \dots = \frac{1}{p} \int C_p dT + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

It is worth looking at some of the subleading results in specific dimensions. For $D = 4$, we have (extending what was presented in ref. [17]):

$$\begin{aligned} r_+ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{T}{p} - \frac{1}{4\pi T} + \frac{1}{8} \frac{p(8\pi p q^2 - 1)}{\pi^2 T^3} + \dots, \\ V &= \frac{4\pi}{3} r_+^3 = \frac{\pi}{6p^3} T^3 - \frac{1}{4} \frac{T}{p^2} + \frac{q^2}{T} + \dots, \\ \int C_p dT &= \frac{\pi}{6p^2} T^3 + \frac{1}{8} \frac{(16\pi p q^2 - 1)}{\pi T} + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

and in $D = 5$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} r_+ &= \frac{3}{4} \frac{T}{p} - \frac{1}{2\pi T} - \frac{p}{3\pi^2 T^3} + \frac{4}{81} \frac{p^2(32q^2\pi^2 p^2 - 9)}{\pi^3 T^5} + \dots, \\ V &= \frac{\pi^2}{2} r_+^4 = \frac{81}{512} \frac{\pi^2}{p^4} T^4 - \frac{27}{64} \frac{\pi T^2}{p^3} + \frac{9}{64p^2} + \frac{4}{3} \frac{\pi p q^2}{T^2} + \dots, \\ \int C_p dT &= \frac{81}{512} \frac{\pi^2}{p^3} T^4 - \frac{27}{128} \frac{\pi T^2}{p^2} + \frac{1}{96} \frac{(192\pi^2 p^2 q^2 - 9)}{\pi T^2} + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

From equation (2), the efficiency is

$$\eta = \frac{W}{Q_H} = \left(1 - \frac{p_4}{p_1} \right) \cdot \frac{p_1(V_2 - V_1)}{Q_H}, \quad (22)$$

where Q_H is given in equation (3). The volumes V_2 and V_1 are simply V evaluated at T_2 and T_1 respectively, with $p = p_1$ in each case. From equation (19) it is clear that the leading terms in our

expressions for the volume and integrated specific heat will always give unity at leading order for their ratio, coming from the factor after the first parentheses. The subleading pieces are of order $1/T^2$ and hence our efficiency at large temperature is

$$\eta = \left(1 - \frac{p_4}{p_1}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{T^2}\right) = \left(1 - \frac{T_4}{T_1}\right) - O\left(\frac{1}{T^2}\right) = \eta_C - O\left(\frac{1}{T^2}\right), \quad (23)$$

where $\eta_C = 1 - T_C/T_H$, the Carnot efficiency of our engine, given its highest and lowest temperatures. This is an upper bound. (In the above, use was made of the “ideal gas” behaviour that is approached at high temperature, equation (14), the fact that corners 1 and 4 in our engine are at the same volume, and the fact that η_C is a maximum efficiency due to the Second Law.) In each case, including the first subleading corrections, we have:

$$\eta = \left(1 - \frac{p_4}{p_1}\right) \left(1 - \frac{3}{2\pi} \frac{p_1}{(T_1^2 + T_1 T_2 + T_2^2)} + \dots\right), \quad (24)$$

for $D = 4$, and

$$\eta = \left(1 - \frac{p_4}{p_1}\right) \left(1 - \frac{4}{3\pi} \frac{p_1}{(T_1^2 + T_2^2)} + \dots\right), \quad (25)$$

for $D = 5$. We will evaluate η further in section 3.3, once we have computed the Gauss–Bonnet corrections.

2.4 Remarks on $q = 0$

It is interesting to note that at $q = 0$ there is an exact relation between r_+ and T that follows from the fact that the equation (10) becomes a quadratic in r_+ in this case, for any D . The solution is:

$$r_+ = \frac{(D-2)}{8p} \left(T \pm \sqrt{T^2 - \frac{4p}{\pi} \frac{D-3}{D-2}} \right). \quad (26)$$

The plus sign choice gives the kind of solution we have seen already, with the large T expansions above being seeded by $r_+ = [(D-2)/4]T/p + O(T^{-1})$. These are the famous “large” AdS black holes that grow with temperature [35]. The negative sign has quite different behaviour, and as is clear from its large T behaviour, $r_+ = [(D-3)/4\pi] \cdot T^{-1} + O(T^{-2})$, corresponds to the famous “small” AdS black holes [35]. It is not hard to see from equation (15) that this behaviour immediately yields a strictly negative specific heat, which starts out as:

$$C_p = -\frac{D-2}{4} \omega_{D-2} \left(\frac{D-3}{4\pi} \right)^{D-2} \frac{1}{T^{D-2}} + O\left(\frac{1}{T^{D-4}}\right), \quad (27)$$

and hence they are not obviously useful as heat engines.

3 The Gauss–Bonnet Corrections

Now we can turn to the main question of this paper, which is how the heat engines are affected by the presence of a Gauss–Bonnet sector. Our action is:

$$I = \frac{1}{16\pi} \int d^D x \sqrt{-g} \left[R - 2\Lambda + \alpha_{\text{GB}} (R_{\gamma\delta\mu\nu} R^{\gamma\delta\mu\nu} - 4R_{\mu\nu} R^{\mu\nu} + R^2) - F^2 \right] , \quad (28)$$

where we see that the Gauss–Bonnet parameter α_{GB} has dimensions of (length)². Since in $D = 4$ the Gauss–Bonnet term is purely topological, we'll work in $D \geq 5$ henceforth.

3.1 The Black Holes

There is a charged static black hole solution of the form given in equations (6,8) but now with [36]:

$$Y(r) = 1 + \frac{r^2}{2\alpha} \left(1 - \sqrt{1 + \frac{4\alpha m}{r^{D-1}} - \frac{4\alpha q^2}{r^{2D-4}} - \frac{4\alpha}{l^2}} \right) , \quad (29)$$

where $\alpha = (D-3)(D-4)\alpha_{\text{GB}}$. The parameters M and q set the mass and charge as before⁶ (see equation (5)), and again the cosmological constant is set by l according to equation (9).

Notice that since the $m = q = 0$ case defining the vacuum solution ought to be well-defined, α cannot be arbitrary, but in fact must be constrained by $0 \leq 4\alpha/l \leq 1$. For later use we can write this in terms of the pressure as:

$$0 \leq \alpha \leq \alpha_* , \quad \text{where} \quad \alpha_* = (D-1)(D-2)/64\pi p . \quad (30)$$

The horizon radius r_+ of the black hole is set by the largest root of $Y(r_+) = 0$, which gives us an equation for M , generalizing equation (11).

$$M = \frac{(D-2)\omega_{D-2}}{16\pi} \left(\alpha r_+^{D-5} + r_+^{D-3} + \frac{q^2}{r_+^{D-3}} + 16\pi p \frac{r_+^{D-1}}{(D-1)(D-2)} \right) , \quad (31)$$

where we have replaced l by p using $p = -\Lambda/8\pi$ and equation (5). This and the next few steps reproduces the results in ref. [36], but with our conventions for the Maxwell sector. The temperature comes from the first derivative of Y at the horizon, in the usual way:

$$T = \frac{Y'(r_+)}{4\pi} = \frac{1}{4\pi r_+(r_+^2 + 2\alpha)} \left(\frac{16\pi p r_+^4}{(D-2)} + (D-3)r_+^2 + (D-5)\alpha - (D-3)\frac{q^2}{r_+^{2D-8}} \right) , \quad (32)$$

The function M defines our enthalpy $H(p, S)$, from which the entropy can be computed as:

$$S = \int_0^{r_+} \frac{1}{T} \frac{\partial M}{\partial r} \Big|_{q,p} dr = \frac{\omega_{D-2}}{4} r_+^{D-2} \left(1 + \frac{2(D-2)}{(D-4)} \frac{\alpha}{r_+^2} \right) . \quad (33)$$

⁶We are using the conventions of ref. [36], with a slight modification of the Maxwell sector.

Since the pressure term in M is unaffected (and all the r_+ dependence determines the S dependence) it is clear that the thermodynamic volume again turns out to be that given in equation (12).

Again we see that for a given α , S and V are not independent, and so the structure of what we saw for $\alpha = 0$ will follow again. We have that $C_V = 0$ and we can compute C_p , so for constructing heat engines using our black holes, the rectangular engine cycle of the last section (see figure 2 and surrounding discussion) is still extremely natural since again. We are now ready to compare the efficiency of our new engines at $\alpha \neq 0$ to that of the last section ($\alpha = 0$).

3.2 The Specific Heat

Using the procedures of section 2.2, we can compute the specific heat in terms of r_+ rather straightforwardly. The full D -dependent expression is rather messy, and so we present it as follows. Writing the temperature in equation (10) as $T = RU$ where $R^{-1} = 4\pi r_+(r_+^2 + 2\alpha)$ and

$$U = \frac{16\pi p r_+^4}{(D-2)} + (D-3)r_+^3 + (D-5)\alpha - (D-3)\frac{q^2}{r_+^{2D-8}}, \quad (34)$$

we get:

$$C_p = (D-2)\frac{\omega_{D-2}}{4} \frac{U(r_+^2 + 2\alpha)[r_+^{D-3} + 2(D-2)\alpha r_+^{D-5}]}{U'|_p(r_+^2 + 2\alpha) - U(r_+^5 + 2\alpha r_+^3 + 2r_+)} . \quad (35)$$

In $D = 5$ the result is:

$$C_p = \frac{3\pi^2}{2} \frac{(8\pi p r_+^6 + 3r_+^4 - 3q^2)(r_+^2 + 2\alpha)^2 r_+}{(8r_+^8 \pi p - 3r_+^6 + 15r_+^2 q^2 + 48\alpha \pi p r_+^6 + 6\alpha r_+^4 + 18\alpha q^2)} . \quad (36)$$

while in $D = 6$ it is:

$$C_p = \frac{8\pi^2}{3} \frac{(4\pi p r_+^8 + 3r_+^6 + \alpha r_+^4 - 3q^2)(r_+^2 + 2\alpha)^2 r_+^2}{(4r_+^{10} \pi p - 3r_+^8 + 3r_+^6 \alpha + 21r_+^2 q^2 + 24\alpha \pi p r_+^8 - 2\alpha^2 r_+^4 + 30\alpha q^2)} \quad (37)$$

3.3 The Engine Efficiency

Again, working in the high temperature limit in order to be able to extract expressions for the integrated specific heat and the volume, we solve equation (32) iteratively for the horizon r_+ as a

function of (T, p, q) , giving, for $D = 5$:

$$\begin{aligned}
r_+ &= \frac{3T}{4p} + \frac{1}{6} \frac{(16\pi\alpha p - 3)}{\pi T} - \frac{1}{27} \frac{p(32\pi\alpha p - 3)(16\pi\alpha p - 3)}{\pi^2 T^3} \\
&\quad + \frac{4}{243} \frac{p^2(-27 + 720\pi\alpha p + 14336\pi^3\alpha^3 p^3 + 96q^2\pi^2 p^2 - 5760\pi^2\alpha^2 p^2)}{\pi^3 T^5} + \dots \\
V &= \frac{81}{512} \frac{\pi^2 T^4}{p^4} + \frac{9}{64} \frac{\pi(16\pi\alpha p - 3)T^2}{p^3} - \frac{1}{64} \frac{256\pi^2\alpha^2 p^2 - 9}{p^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{9} \frac{(9\alpha + 512\pi^2 p^2\alpha^3 + 12\pi p q^2 - 144\pi p\alpha^2)}{T^2} + \dots \\
\int C_p dT &= \frac{81}{512} \frac{\pi^2 T^4}{p^3} + \frac{9}{128} \frac{\pi(32\pi\alpha p - 3)T^2}{p^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{288} \frac{(-27 + 864\pi\alpha p + 16384\pi^3\alpha^3 p^3 + 576q^2\pi^2 p^2 - 6912\pi^2\alpha^2 p^2)}{\pi T^2} + \dots, \quad (38)
\end{aligned}$$

a deformation, by α , of our expressions in equation (21).

The efficiency of our engine cycle in figure 2 is given (perturbatively) by inserting these new quantities into equation (22), and we can now answer the question of how our Gauss–Bonnet deformation has affected –increased or decreased– the efficiency of our engine. We can follow the efficiency as a function of α , seeing how it behaves as we move away from $\alpha = 0$. From the form of the expansion, it is also clear that we must be careful, at any given order in the $1/T$ expansion, to not take α (or really, the product αp) too large so as not to compromise the accuracy of the expansion. Before we do that exploration, we must decide what parameters of the cycle we specify and hold fixed as we compare different engines by changing α . There is a variety of choices, but we’ll study two schemes in what follows.

3.3.1 Scheme 1

Here, for our engine cycle (see figure 2) we specify the two operating pressures (p_1, p_4) and the two temperatures (T_1, T_2) . Specifying those two temperatures is in some sense in natural accordance with how the input heat Q_H is defined in equation (3), using the pressure p_1 of the isobar and the beginning and ending temperatures of the isobaric expansion phase. We can compute the efficiency in this scheme as a function of α , seeing how it moves away from the standard set by $\alpha = 0$.

Actually, at a given value of α another important standard to compare to is the Carnot efficiency $\eta_C = 1 - T_C/T_H$ which is the efficiency we’d get with a reversible heat engine operating between those same two temperatures. (Recall that T_C and T_H are the lowest and highest temperatures our engine can attain.) Although we’ve specified $T_H \equiv T_2$, η_C changes with α since T_C does: The equation of state (32) must be used to determine $T_4 \equiv T_C$.

In fact, as α increases T_C falls, meaning that the Carnot cycle available is *more* efficient with increasing α . At large α , T_C asymptotes to a finite positive value that can be determined by




Figure 3: (a) The value of T_C as α varies. (b) The maximum possible (Carnot) efficiency, η_C , as α varies. (Here, we've chosen the values $p_1 = 5, p_4 = 3, T_1 = 50, T_2 = 60$, and $q = 0.1$. The same key features were observed for a range of sample values, including even higher temperatures.)

using equation (32) in the limit of large α , yielding:

$$T_C \rightarrow \frac{p_4}{p_1} T_1, \quad \eta_C \rightarrow 1 - \frac{p_4}{p_1} \cdot \frac{T_1}{T_2}, \quad \text{as } \alpha \rightarrow \infty. \quad (39)$$

(See figure 3 for a numerical example of the exact⁷ (*i.e.*, not perturbative in a $(1/T)$ expansion) behaviour of T_C and η_C with α .) In fact, the system never gets to the limit (39), since there's actually a strong bound on α set by equation (30), coming from the constraint to have a physical vacuum solution, and we will take this into account shortly.

We can study the efficiency of our engine at various α , and also compare to the available Carnot efficiency at the same α . In figure 4(a) the two efficiencies are plotted for increasing values of α . Figure 4(b) displays the ratio η/η_C . It is apparent that the efficiency grows, approaching the Carnot value. For large enough α the efficiency appears to reach and surpass the Carnot value, which would be a clear violation of the Second Law of Thermodynamics. This therefore seems to place a (weak) constraint on the allowed value of α , but caution must be applied here: The efficiency here has only been computed perturbatively. Looking at the form of the large T expansions for the various ingredients of the efficiency (38), it is clear that increasing α undermines the accuracy of the large T expansion, and therefore we should distrust features at large α . In figure 5 the efficiencies are compared only over the physical range $0 < \alpha < \alpha_*$ (with α_* given by equation (30)). Here, p_1

⁷In earlier versions of this manuscript, the values of T used in numerical explorations were not large enough given the values of α we explored, leading to a vanishing T_C at some value of α when using our approximate expressions. We thank Shao-Wen Wei for pointing this out.




Figure 4: (a) The approximate engine efficiency η as α varies, in scheme 1. The upper curve shows the exact Carnot efficiency η_C , for comparison. (b) The ratio η/η_C over the same range, also in scheme 1. See text for discussion. The actual physical range of α is much smaller (see text), and is displayed in figure 5. (See the caption of figure 3 for parameter values.)

was used to set the bound since that is the highest pressure achieved in the engine. Figure 5(a) shows ratio η/η_C , and it increases over the physical range. Defining η_0 as the efficiency at $\alpha = 0$, figure 5(b) shows that the ratio η/η_0 increases over the physical range. We now turn to scheme 2.

3.3.2 Scheme 2

In this scheme for our engine (referring again to figure 2) we instead specify the temperatures (T_2, T_4) , equivalent to specifying (T_H, T_C) , as well as the volumes (V_2, V_4) (which also gives the pair (V_3, V_1)). This might be considered a natural choice if one is constructing an engine with specific initial and final volumes in mind. Now the Carnot efficiency η_C is fixed for all α . Instead, however, the pressures $p_1 = p_2$ and $p_4 = p_3$ must be determined using the equation of state, and so are now α -dependent. A study of how the efficiency η varies with respect to α shows that initially it falls as compared to η_C , but then rises again, approaching η_C . As in scheme 1, a loose upper bound on α then comes from the restriction that $\eta \leq \eta_C$ — anything higher would violate the Second Law. See figure 6(a). As noted in scheme 1, this large α feature is likely an artefact of the large T expansion losing its accuracy at the order we are working. As before, there is a stronger upper bound on α , denoted α_* , whose value is given by equation (30). The bound is more subtle to implement here since the pressures in our engine are α dependent. However, one can proceed as follows. At a given value of α , we can compute the largest pressure ($p_1 = p_2$) that occurs in the engine, and check whether the limiting $\alpha_* = (D - 1)(D - 2)/64\pi p_1(\alpha)$ is less than α . If it is, then that particular




Figure 5: (a) The ratio η/η_C vs α in scheme 1, plotted over the smaller physical range of α determined by equation (30). (b) The ratio η/η_0 over that same physical range. (See the caption of figure 3 for parameter values.)

engine is not physical and we have strayed beyond the maximum α . Put differently, as a function of α there is a curve $\alpha_*(\alpha)$ which starts out at some positive value at $\alpha = 0$. At some point it meets the line of slope unity, and that determines α 's maximum value. See figure 6(b). Again, we define η_0 as the efficiency at $\alpha = 0$. The ratios η/η_C and η/η_0 are plotted in figure 7(a) and (b), both *decreasing* with α , in contrast with scheme 1.

It is worth noting that the $D = 6$ case was explored explicitly as well, for each scheme, and the qualitative structure of the results in the physical range of equation (30) was found to be the same as for the $D = 5$ case explored here, so no detailed results are reported from that case. It is expected that higher D will also work similarly since there are no key new features in the equation of state or other key relations that can arise as a function of D .

4 Closing Remarks

After careful clarification and extension of the results of ref. [17] for holographic heat engines in Einstein–Maxwell gravity (with negative Λ) we added a Gauss–Bonnet sector and computed analogous results for similarly defined heat engines. It was particularly interesting to see what happens to the efficiency η (at least in the large T limit) in the presence of the Gauss–Bonnet sector, for a particular choice of engine cycle (defined in figure 2). Such higher curvature corrections to the gravity theory affect both the black holes' heat capacity and their ability to do mechanical work (since their size depends upon the Gauss Bonnet coefficient α_{GB}) and hence it is not *a priori* obvious as to how the efficiency would be affected. Moreover, we learned that how η is affected




Figure 6: (a) The approximate efficiency η vs α , in scheme 2. The upper curve shows the exact Carnot efficiency η_C . There is a smaller physical range for α (see text), displayed in figure 7. (b) The determination of the smaller physical range of α according to equation (30), taking into account that the pressures of the cycle are α -dependent. (See text). (For these examples, $T_2 \equiv T_H = 60$, $V_2 = 33000$, $T_4 \equiv T_C = 30$, $V_4 = 15500$. The same key features were observed for a range of sample values, including even higher temperatures.)

also depends upon what parameters of the engine cycle are held fixed as α_{GB} , the coefficient of the Gauss–Bonnet terms, is changed.

We compared the efficiency as a function of α_{GB} to two natural quantities: (1) the efficiency at $\alpha_{\text{GB}} = 0$, denoted η_0 , and (2) the maximum (Carnot) efficiency, η_C . Furthermore, we examined two schemes for which parameters of the engine to hold fixed as we change α_{GB} , and the effects on the efficiency differed in each scheme. This is because the equation of state is α_{GB} dependent, and so the parameters of the engine *not* held fixed depend upon α_{GB} . This has a scheme dependent effect on the efficiency. The question therefore arises as to which is the better overall benchmark for measuring the effects of the Gauss–Bonnet sector on η . If there is anything close to a scheme-independent answer to this question (and it is not clear that there is), perhaps the Carnot standard, asking how η/η_C has changed, is more robust since there is an unambiguous and universal meaning to what that Carnot engine is, and its efficiency takes as input only the highest and lowest temperatures (T_H and T_C respectively) in the engine under discussion. This becomes even stronger in a scheme (such as scheme 2) which holds T_H and T_C fixed as α_{GB} varies.

The physics of Einstein gravity with negative cosmological constant is believed to be holographically dual to large N (for suitably defined N) field theories in one dimension fewer, and higher curvature corrections such as Gauss–Bonnet terms correspond to particular classes of $1/N$ corrections to the duality. While it is not yet clear what they might teach us about the dual field theories, our holographic heat engines define cycles on the space of the dual field theories [17] (since




Figure 7: (a) The ratio η/η_C vs α , and (b) the ratio η/η_0 vs α in scheme 2 over the physical range given by equation (30), implemented as described in the text. (See the caption of figure 6 for parameter values.)

varying p ends up changing the N of the field theory (*e.g.* the N in an $SU(N)$ Yang–Mills in the case of $D = 5$). Our new results then tell us about the changes to the efficiency of the engines once certain $1/N$ corrections are added. It would be interesting to explore the meaning of our results from a field theory perspective, but this awaits further work on the precise meaning of the heat engine cycles for the dual field theory.

It would also be interesting to study the effects on the heat engines that can be defined for other classes of extension or deformation of Einstein–Maxwell gravity, whether motivated by dual field theory considerations or not. We hope to report new results from this avenue of investigation in the near future.

Acknowledgements

CVJ would like to thank the US Department of Energy for support under grant DE-FG03-84ER-40168, and Amelia for her support and patience.

References

- [1] J. D. Bekenstein, “Black holes and entropy,” *Phys.Rev.* **D7** (1973) 2333–2346.
- [2] J. D. Bekenstein, “Generalized second law of thermodynamics in black hole physics,” *Phys.Rev.* **D9** (1974) 3292–3300.

- [3] S. Hawking, “Particle Creation by Black Holes,” *Commun.Math.Phys.* **43** (1975) 199–220.
- [4] S. Hawking, “Black Holes and Thermodynamics,” *Phys.Rev.* **D13** (1976) 191–197.
- [5] M. M. Caldarelli, G. Cognola, and D. Klemm, “Thermodynamics of Kerr-Newman-AdS black holes and conformal field theories,” *Class.Quant.Grav.* **17** (2000) 399–420, [arXiv:hep-th/9908022](#) [hep-th].
- [6] S. Wang, S.-Q. Wu, F. Xie, and L. Dan, “The First laws of thermodynamics of the (2+1)-dimensional BTZ black holes and Kerr-de Sitter spacetimes,” *Chin.Phys.Lett.* **23** (2006) 1096–1098, [arXiv:hep-th/0601147](#) [hep-th].
- [7] Y. Sekiwa, “Thermodynamics of de Sitter black holes: Thermal cosmological constant,” *Phys.Rev.* **D73** (2006) 084009, [arXiv:hep-th/0602269](#) [hep-th].
- [8] E. A. Larranaga Rubio, “Stringy Generalization of the First Law of Thermodynamics for Rotating BTZ Black Hole with a Cosmological Constant as State Parameter,” [arXiv:0711.0012](#) [gr-qc].
- [9] D. Kastor, S. Ray, and J. Traschen, “Enthalpy and the Mechanics of AdS Black Holes,” *Class.Quant.Grav.* **26** (2009) 195011, [arXiv:0904.2765](#) [hep-th].
- [10] B. P. Dolan, “The cosmological constant and the black hole equation of state,” *Class.Quant.Grav.* **28** (2011) 125020, [arXiv:1008.5023](#) [gr-qc].
- [11] M. Cvetič, G. Gibbons, D. Kubiznak, and C. Pope, “Black Hole Enthalpy and an Entropy Inequality for the Thermodynamic Volume,” *Phys.Rev.* **D84** (2011) 024037, [arXiv:1012.2888](#) [hep-th].
- [12] B. P. Dolan, “Compressibility of rotating black holes,” *Phys.Rev.* **D84** (2011) 127503, [arXiv:1109.0198](#) [gr-qc].
- [13] B. P. Dolan, “Pressure and volume in the first law of black hole thermodynamics,” *Class.Quant.Grav.* **28** (2011) 235017, [arXiv:1106.6260](#) [gr-qc].
- [14] M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, “The Cosmological Constant as a Canonical Variable,” *Phys.Lett.* **B143** (1984) 415–420.
- [15] C. Teitelboim, “The Cosmological Constant as a Thermodynamic Black Hole Parameter,” *Phys.Lett.* **B158** (1985) 293–297.

- [16] M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, “The Cosmological Constant and General Covariance,” *Phys.Lett.* **B222** (1989) 195–199.
- [17] C. V. Johnson, “Holographic Heat Engines,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **31** (2014) 205002, [arXiv:1404.5982 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [18] J. M. Maldacena, “The large n limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity,” *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2** (1998) 231–252, [hep-th/9711200](#).
- [19] E. Witten, “Anti-de sitter space and holography,” *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2** (1998) 253–291, [hep-th/9802150](#).
- [20] S. S. Gubser, I. R. Klebanov, and A. M. Polyakov, “Gauge theory correlators from non-critical string theory,” *Phys. Lett.* **B428** (1998) 105–114, [hep-th/9802109](#).
- [21] E. Witten, “Anti-de sitter space, thermal phase transition, and confinement in gauge theories,” *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2** (1998) 505–532, [hep-th/9803131](#).
- [22] O. Aharony, S. S. Gubser, J. M. Maldacena, H. Ooguri, and Y. Oz, “Large n field theories, string theory and gravity,” *Phys. Rept.* **323** (2000) 183–386, [hep-th/9905111](#).
- [23] A. Karch and B. Robinson, “Holographic Black Hole Chemistry,” [arXiv:1510.02472 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [24] A. Belhaj, M. Chabab, H. El Moumni, K. Masmar, M. B. Sedra, and A. Segui, “On Heat Properties of AdS Black Holes in Higher Dimensions,” *JHEP* **05** (2015) 149, [arXiv:1503.07308 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [25] J. Sadeghi and K. Jafarzade, “Heat Engine of black holes,” [arXiv:1504.07744 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [26] E. Caceres, P. H. Nguyen, and J. F. Pedraza, “Holographic entanglement entropy and the extended phase structure of STU black holes,” *JHEP* **09** (2015) 184, [arXiv:1507.06069 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [27] M. R. Setare and H. Adami, “Polytropic black hole as a heat engine,” *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **47** (2015) no. 11, 133.
- [28] B. Zwiebach, “Curvature Squared Terms and String Theories,” *Phys. Lett.* **B156** (1985) 315.
- [29] R.-G. Cai, “Gauss-Bonnet black holes in AdS spaces,” *Phys. Rev.* **D65** (2002) 084014, [arXiv:hep-th/0109133 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [30] M. Brigante, H. Liu, R. C. Myers, S. Shenker, and S. Yaida, “Viscosity Bound Violation in Higher Derivative Gravity,” *Phys. Rev.* **D77** (2008) 126006, [arXiv:0712.0805 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [31] M. Brigante, H. Liu, R. C. Myers, S. Shenker, and S. Yaida, “The Viscosity Bound and Causality Violation,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100** (2008) 191601, [arXiv:0802.3318 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [32] A. Chamblin, R. Emparan, C. V. Johnson, and R. C. Myers, “Charged AdS black holes and catastrophic holography,” *Phys. Rev.* **D60** (1999) 064018, [hep-th/9902170](#).
- [33] A. Chamblin, R. Emparan, C. V. Johnson, and R. C. Myers, “Holography, thermodynamics and fluctuations of charged ads black holes,” *Phys. Rev.* **D60** (1999) 104026, [hep-th/9904197](#).
- [34] D. Kubiznak and R. B. Mann, “P-V criticality of charged AdS black holes,” *JHEP* **1207** (2012) 033, [arXiv:1205.0559 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [35] S. W. Hawking and D. N. Page, “Thermodynamics of Black Holes in anti-De Sitter Space,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **87** (1983) 577.
- [36] R.-G. Cai, L.-M. Cao, L. Li, and R.-Q. Yang, “P-V criticality in the extended phase space of Gauss-Bonnet black holes in AdS space,” *JHEP* **09** (2013) 005, [arXiv:1306.6233 \[gr-qc\]](#).